

Abstract

Nineteenth-century antiquarianism drew a firm distinction between 'local' and 'national' forms of knowledge, which featured in the construction of expertise and authority in the field. Using debates over the architecture of Peterborough Cathedral and their reception as a case study, this paper argues that such hierarchies need to be problematized and may have been proposed more to benefit those whose expertise and authority had little external endorsement than as a valid characterization. The paper also includes discussion of the different interpretations of the chronology of Peterborough's nave and west front and the evolution of understanding of its monastic plan, revealing the early genesis of many aspects of modern readings of the archaeological and documentary evidence.

‘Valuable Matter’ versus ‘Local Twaddle’

Peterborough Cathedral and architectural expertise in the 19th century

Alexandrina Buchanan

WHEN the Archaeological Institute (hereafter A.I.) visited Peterborough in 1861, coverage by the *Saturday Review* was somewhat equivocal. As the anonymous reporter wrote,

It was unlucky, and indeed unkind, to allow a couple of well-meaning local clergymen to exhibit themselves as rivals of men like Mr. Earle and Professor Babington. But, on the whole, the proportion of valuable matter was greater, and the proportion of local twaddle less, than usual.¹

The contrast between ‘valuable matter’ and ‘local twaddle’ was a recurring theme of 19th-century antiquarianism. My aims in this paper are to outline the construction of ‘local’ versus ‘general’ in both communities and evaluate these categories within 19th-century antiquarianism; to consider contemporary literature and scholarship on Peterborough Cathedral from this perspective; and to use the 1861 Congress of the Archaeological Institute, in particular the architectural elements, to explore how contemporary understandings of the relationship between ‘local’ and ‘national’ intersected with issues of knowledge exchange, expertise, and authority.² In this context, expertise is defined as the *ability* to contribute to knowledge formation, whilst authority represents both the socially endorsed *right* to contribute and *recognition* for having done so. The same reviewer, the following year, concluded: ‘Our experience tells us that, as a general rule, relations between local and general antiquaries are very much what they should be’.³ It will be argued that these ‘right relations’ were carefully policed and that men such as the reviewer, identified as the historian Edward Augustus Freeman (1823–92), both played an essential role in this ‘boundary work’ and stood to benefit from it.

The separation of local and national forms of knowledge is not a modern phenomenon. The *Saturday Review* article quoted was far from unique in emphasizing these themes and focussing on the relationship between local archaeological societies and the national bodies. Its author, Freeman, linked knowledge with the identity of its creators and the places of its creation. Simply put, local lore could contribute to general knowledge, which would then legitimate local lore, a model of knowledge exchange also found in scientific discourse. Networks of knowledge were formalized to support this interaction: the founders of the British Archaeological Association in 1843 and the Archaeological Institute a year later aimed to provide sectoral leadership where they considered the earlier Society of Antiquaries had failed because of its lack of local links (and elitism). Leaders of the local societies were usually members of the B.A.A. or the A.I. (or both) and these appointed local secretaries to communicate local findings to the meetings of the national body and collect subscriptions.⁴ Nevertheless, the need for many of the

local bodies to club together from 1850 in the separate ‘Associated Architectural Societies’ for publishing purposes is suggestive of ongoing problems with national coordination, particularly in comparison with France, where historical and archaeological scholarship was actively supported by the State.⁵ Examination of the issue therefore needs to take account of contemporary anxieties.

The high point of the A.I.’s calendar was the annual congress, at which national and local figures could meet and interact. Although modelled on the yearly meetings of bodies such as the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the A.I. congresses differed from their scientific counterparts by having a deliberately local dimension: destinations were chosen on the basis of sites of interest, specifically a cathedral.⁶ This localism provides a distinction between the ‘geography’ of antiquarian knowledge, and that of science: again, in the words of Freeman, ‘Chemistry and dynamics must be exactly the same at Penzance and at Aberdeen’.⁷ This sweeping statement has been challenged by recent work on the geography of science; nevertheless, antiquarianism had a particular spatial inflection.⁸ 19th-century science aimed at the universality of general laws, but whilst 19th-century antiquarianism held these as an ideal, the number of external factors deemed influential upon created forms like buildings (including geology, climate, religion, race, and individual creativity) disrupted the search for universally applicable principles.

The 1861 meeting at Peterborough was a critical moment for the Archaeological Institute. The Gloucester Congress the previous year and the Bath Congress in 1858 had been condemned by the *Saturday Review* precisely because the balance between local and national had not been appropriately struck.⁹ The opening lecture of the Peterborough Congress demonstrates how the local/national dichotomy informed proceedings.¹⁰ The speaker, Thomas James, honorary canon of Peterborough, with livings in both Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, had published a review of recent publications on Northamptonshire antiquities in the *Quarterly Review* on which he drew heavily.¹¹ There was, however, a notable change of focus between review and lecture.

In the former, James emphasized the importance of studying local topography as a *precursor* to the study of geography and history more generally.¹² In his lecture, however, the terrain was represented not as the site of a journey which started from local topography and led to more universal themes, but as a series of fields for battle between local and national antiquarians. On the topic of the authenticity of the Ingulf chronicle (potentially a key source for Peterborough history), for example, James suggested that ‘if the interest of the Meeting flagged, he would recommend their worthy secretary to set up champions on either side, and might he (Mr. James) be there to hear’.¹³

Disputes between different parties were a deeply rooted aspect of antiquarian activity, here given a specifically local/national twist. Besides Ingulf and a series of supposedly Saxon charters, at issue was the date of the so-called Hedda stone (one of the attractions of Peterborough Cathedral, exhibited as a memorial to the eponymous monk and his companions, said to have been murdered by the Vikings).¹⁴ James’s predictions were prescient: over the course of the Peterborough Congress, the Master of the Rolls, Henry Riley, exposed Ingulf’s chronicle as a later forgery, and a young William Stubbs (later Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford) threw doubt on the provenance of some of the monastery’s earliest charters. Matthew Holbeche Bloxam, author of *The Principles of Gothic Architecture* and other influential texts, argued that not only was the story of the murdered Hedda only found in Ingulf and was therefore merely legendary but the iconography of the Hedda stone clearly represented Christ and his apostles and (he claimed) the style was that of the Norman period.¹⁵ On each topic, the A.I.’s authorities explicitly rejected previous claims by local antiquaries.

James’s review had also mentioned a current dispute over the date and design of the Peterborough west front, whose protagonists were Owen Davys, Frederick Apthorp Paley, and George Ayliffe Poole, all local men who had published on the subject. Attendees at the congress might therefore have anticipated a debate on this topic but, in contrast with many previous meetings, the chronology of the cathedral proved remarkably uncontentious. Why this

difference?

To answer this question, we need first to review the literature on Peterborough within its spatial context which, for the more discerning reader, affected the ways in which books were read and their authors estimated.¹⁶ ‘Local’ authors were generally published by local printers, making their works hard to access outside their locality, though such books might also be picked up and distributed by London booksellers. They were less frequently reviewed in the national periodicals and, when discussed, might be assessed with some condescension.¹⁷ The *Saturday Review* identified the local antiquary as ‘one who knows his own neighbourhood and little else’, whose writing style was often prosy and pretentious, ‘interlarded with innumerable quotations from third-rate poets’.¹⁸ This evaluation was, however, a 19th-century innovation, not found in the 18th century or earlier.

The first antiquarian work on the cathedral was written by Simon Gunton, a prebendary of the cathedral, published posthumously in 1686.¹⁹ 17th-century antiquarianism was typically local: even authoritative figures such as William Dugdale, Robert Plot, and John Aubrey, expert antiquaries of the period, saw the county as the natural unit for antiquarian scholarship. Researched in local, privately held, archives and often published by subscription, local networks of support were vital to such outputs but, crucially, there was no ignominy associated with being a local author or writing on a local topic. There were exceptions to the local norm: Browne Willis aimed for nationwide coverage and included Peterborough in his *Mitred Abbies*. Nevertheless, after Gunton, the most significant pre-1800 account was in John Bridges’s *Northamptonshire*, another local production.

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-001 Here]

Figure 19.1 Hedda Stone reproduced from *The Antiquarian and Topographical Cabinet*, 1817.

– 1/3rd page

The late 18th century saw a growth in interest in antiquarianism, creating a market for more ‘popular’ productions, both for local consumption and for the burgeoning tourist industry.

As a town on the Great North Road, Peterborough was a natural stopping point for travellers and the 1817 *Antiquarian and Topographical Cabinet* illustrated the Hedda Stone with the cope of Abbot Caleto (1250–63) hung behind it, nailed to a white cloth, ‘as shewn to every visitor of the cathedral’ (Figure 19.1).²⁰ From 1782, Peterborough publishers J. Jacob and Charles Jacob issued a series of new editions and epitomes of Gunton’s text for this market, attributed by John Britton and others to Thomas Kipling, dean of Peterborough, as editor.²¹ Meanwhile some London publishers began to specialize in antiquarian texts, and Peterborough featured in the ‘Cathedrals Series’ (illustrated accounts of all the English cathedrals) published by Storer (1814–19), Britton (1814–35) and Winkles (1836–42), as well as in the gazetteer appended to the 1819 edition of Thomas Rickman’s *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture*. It is in this context of topographical publishing that we find a new distinction being drawn between local and national scholarship. Britton, for example, recognized the benefits a local scholar might enjoy:

To produce a work like Bentham’s *History of Ely Cathedral* requires long continued residence in a place – free and unreserved access to all local and general records – much leisure to devote to the subject, as well as zeal and love for such pursuits.²²

Without such advantages, Britton was reliant on local knowledge and patronage and, regarding Peterborough, acknowledged his unusually heavy debt both to the dean and chapter and to local clergyman and schoolmaster, Thomas Garbett (d.1838), who supplied an account of the west front.²³ Garbett achieved national recognition as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries; nevertheless, his antiquarian knowledge seems to have been limited to the immediate locality.

Despite acknowledging his local debts, Britton also identified local partisanship as the enemy of a search for truth: ‘The person always, or generally attached to *one* church, is certainly not well qualified to appreciate its beauties and defects – its real and comparative importance. He usually acquires a common-place and technical mode of commenting on it; and too frequently

continues and perseveres in old prejudices and established errors'.²⁴ Whereas: 'Unlike the local ciceroni, and the provincial antiquary, who direct *all* their attention and admiration to a single edifice, and who thereby imperceptibly acquire an indiscriminating prejudice in favour of such subject, it is the good fortune of the author [. . .] to have no predilection or partiality for any one cathedral'.²⁵ In such comments we see the construction of a hierarchy of expertise, which placed national figures above their local counterparts.

Through tireless publication, combined with equally tireless self-promotion, Britton's became the basic texts on the English cathedrals and his account of Peterborough gained wide currency through reproduction in more popular works, including *The Mirror* and the 1843 guide by Peterborough-born George Searle Phillips.²⁶ Phillips's guide, which was published in London and went through multiple editions, was evidently intended to be used by tourists whilst visiting the building. Having quoted Garbett's description of the west front from Britton, the text continues in topographical order:

With this short sketch of the exterior architecture of the church we shall content ourselves, and proceed to describe the situation of the building; conducting the reader through the old gateway into the great court before the west front.²⁷

Through topographical presentation, knowledge was given a particularly local dimension, directing attention to specific spots, which then authenticated their textual description. Such guidebooks were obviously intended to accompany the visitor, but at Peterborough there was also an early experiment with information boards. In 1854, the cathedral became the first to be opened freely for visitors at advertised times, and cards with an account of the architecture and objects of special interest were suspended at various parts of the building.²⁸

Guidebooks, like Phillips's, could have been purchased locally from a number of outlets, all close to the cathedral for visiting tourists. William Whellan's directory lists four booksellers in Peterborough, two of whom also operated libraries (in addition to the cathedral, Union and Mechanics' Institute libraries).²⁹ One, Joseph Slatterie Clarke, had a 'fancy repository' in the

market-place and later became proprietor of the *Peterborough Advertiser*. He became a significant publisher of cathedral guides, including an 1838 guidebook, the third edition of Phillips's *Guide* (1849) and Thomas Craddock's *Peterborough Cathedral: A General, Architectural, and Monastic History* (1864). George Caster, the publisher of the edition of Phillips revised by the Rev. W. D. Sweeting (1893), may have been related to Clarke.³⁰

Whilst tourism offered one impetus for publication, the local archaeological and architectural societies supported local research by providing an audience, vehicles for data collection and dissemination and cultural capital for those involved. Their members both demanded and contributed to accounts of the cathedral's architecture which adopted the more archaeological approach promoted by Britton and Rickman.

The Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton was founded in 1844, with the new president of the A.I., the marquis of Northampton, playing an important founding role. The Soke of Peterborough formed part of Northamptonshire, making Peterborough the society's local cathedral and the train line from Northampton (opened 1845), seemed designed to meet the needs of local antiquaries, passing through Castle Ashby, Earls Barton, Elton (for Fotheringhay), and Castor. The Northamptonshire society's objects were as much ecclesiological as antiquarian and had close links with the diocese: in 1850, the bishop of Peterborough was its patron, the dean was a vice-president and all the canons were members. Other Peterborough members exemplify the make-up of the society more generally, consisting of the Rev. Robert Bell, perpetual curate of the recently constructed church of Eye; W. Gates (possibly from same family as John and Henry Pearson Gates, secretaries to the bishop); Lieut.-Col. Abraham Hardy, and John Thompson, a local builder. It was very Anglican in composition and presumably had a high crossover membership with the Diocesan Church Building Association (founded in 1838 as a local body in association with the Incorporated Church Building Society, with the marquis of Northampton playing a leading role³¹).

Although Peterborough fell within Northamptonshire, from 1839 the diocese included the

archdeaconry of Leicestershire (previously part of the diocese of Lincoln), and that county's Architectural and Archaeological Society was founded in 1855 at the behest of the bishop, following a successful meeting in Leicester of the Northamptonshire society and its Lincolnshire equivalent in 1854.³² At its first meeting, the new body was invited by the dean of Peterborough to meet with the Northamptonshire society and other members of the Associated Architectural Societies in Peterborough, evidence of a coordinated effort to build regional capacity for antiquarian endeavour. This three-day event included lectures on the cathedral by Poole and on the west front by Davys.³³ Poole was soon made an honorary member of the society, along with fellow Northamptonshire stalwarts Canon James, Matthew Holbeche Bloxam, and Sir Henry Dryden; also appointed as honoraries were national figures: the Rev. John Louis Petit and architect George Gilbert Scott. Honorary status provided public recognition of the contribution of the more local figures, whilst the 'national' honoraries reinforced the link with the A.I., of which they were members, and added kudos to the local body.

It should be noted that within the hierarchy of archaeological societies headed by the B.A.A. and the A.I., the county and archdeaconry societies were originally intended to coordinate an even more localized system. In the second report of the Northamptonshire society it was observed that

the most truly important Meetings have been those of Members of the Society, associated in smaller groups and labouring in more limited districts, in subordination to the general body. Fixed to one spot itself, and of unwieldy bulk, it is to these local associations that the Society must chiefly look for the spread of its spirit and influence over the Archdeaconry, as well as for the acquisition of that knowledge which it is part of its object to record and to disseminate.³⁴

The ideal was of a two-way flow of knowledge, from the locality to the metropolis, where it would be digested into general laws to be conveyed back to the regions. The reality, however, was less systematic.

Contemporary understanding of the relationship between local and national antiquarianism as a hierarchy did not necessarily encourage participation at the ‘higher’ level. The value of antiquarian activity in a civic associational context, where impact could be readily experienced in supporting restorations, collecting and disseminating data (including physical objects for display in local museums), building links with local grandees, and establishing personal expertise – at a level where challenge was less likely – encouraged local involvement by individuals who showed no appetite for engagement at a national level. More ‘general’ knowledge required access to a good library, the time and money for more extensive travel and the confidence to claim status as an ‘authority’.

Nevertheless, during the 1840s and 1850s three accounts of Peterborough Cathedral appeared which, although in some senses ‘local’, problematize the distinction drawn so readily by the *Saturday Review* in 1861. The first was by Davys, *An Historical and Architectural Guide to Peterborough Cathedral*, published in 1846 alongside an engraving of the west front from one of his own drawings, dedicated to the Northamptonshire Architectural Society. The author was a teenager, not yet at Cambridge. As the son of the bishop and nephew of the eponymous archdeacon of Northampton, he had an inside perspective on the building, and ambitions for liturgical and architectural improvements which were warmly welcomed by the reviewer of the work in *The Ecclesiastic*.³⁵ His text was aimed at both the ‘architectural student’ and the general reader, the latter being assisted by footnote explanations of architectural terms which might be unfamiliar. The review at national level (perhaps assisted by his lineage) and the many editions the book received (distributed in London from the second edition onwards) suggests relatively wide reception. Although his arguments were largely derived from Britton, his knowledge of ‘hard words’ and up-to-date methods implied specialist expertise, revealing what could be picked up locally through reading and networking.

Similarly up-to-date were works by Paley (*Remarks on the Architecture of Peterborough Cathedral*, first edition, 1849) and Poole (‘On the Abbey Church of Peterborough’, published in the *Proceedings of the Northamptonshire Architectural Society* for 1854–5). Unlike Davys, these

works offered their own original conclusions, thus marking their authors as having ‘contributory’ expertise.³⁶ Paley, grandson of the theologian, was a Cambridge graduate but had failed to obtain a fellowship.³⁷ He remained in Cambridge and in 1839 became one of the founders (and honorary secretary) of the Cambridge Camden Society, under whose auspices he began publishing architectural texts: *Church Restorers: A Tale* (1844), *Ecclesiologist’s Guide to Churches within a Circuit of Seven Miles Round Cambridge* (1844); *Illustrations of Baptismal Fonts* (1844); *A Manual of Gothic Architecture* (1846) and, most significant in this context, *A Manual of Gothic Mouldings* (first edition, 1845; second enlarged edition, 1847). Although not containing much original research, these works collated current scholarship and, in the case of the mouldings manual, provided a new body of data for architects and archaeologists. Nevertheless, after converting to Rome in 1846/7, Paley fell out with his Cambridge associates and moved to Peterborough with no evidence of any connection with any of the architectural or archaeological societies thereafter, their heavily Anglican membership possibly forming an obstacle to his involvement.

Paley’s introduction explicitly claimed adherence to the new archaeological methods:

I do not pretend any greater acuteness than my predecessors; but I have endeavored to apply a method of investigation which has been rather lately introduced; – that, I mean, pursued in the publications of the ‘Archaeological Institute,’ and especially in Professor Willis’s detailed descriptions of York and Canterbury Cathedrals. Of course, the result must depend on the skill of the party who makes use of the principle: and I can only say, that I have no doubt a great deal more might be found out by its aid than I have been able to discover, or have had time to verify by more extended enquiries.³⁸

Paley thus situated himself as a follower, but associated himself with the scholar generally perceived to be the founder of a new field of study.³⁹ He claimed local expertise, combined with a more general understanding. An idea of his intended audience may be gauged from the fact that

his quotations from the chronicles are in Latin (unlike e.g. Willis, who generally used translation in the main text, Latin in the footnotes). More practical issues also prevented the wider dissemination of his account. It was published by Robert Gardner, the local printer and stationer also responsible for Davys's book, but although distributed by George Bell in London, seems not to have reached a wide audience. Its specialist style made it less palatable for the general or local reader, it went unnoticed by the antiquarian press, and in the introduction to his 1855 paper, Poole wrote: 'I had not seen, indeed I did not even know of its existence, until I had written and nearly re-written my paper'.⁴⁰ John Bilson (1856–1945), whose Romanesque interests drew him to Peterborough, was aware of the importance of Paley's account but had not read it.⁴¹ Neither edition is held in the library of the Society of Antiquaries. Despite his expertise, therefore, he was unlikely to achieve recognition as an authority.

Poole never belonged to the Camdenians but acquired his High Church ecclesiology from the Rev. Walter Hook at Leeds, where he was curate of St. James's church (1839–43), wrote his *Appropriate Character of Church Architecture* (1842, reissued as *Churches; Their Structure, Arrangement, and Decoration* in 1846) and started to research the local churches, published as *Churches of Yorkshire* (1844).⁴² He then moved to Northamptonshire, where he became vicar of Welford and a keen member of the local architectural society. Although a prolific scholar, he limited his studies to local buildings and did not make the step up to pronouncing on churches outside his area. His account of Peterborough was first delivered as a lecture, then published by the Northamptonshire Architectural Society, and was explicit in its use of the same methods as Paley: 'He goes over the same ground that I do, and in the same manner; patiently examining both authorities and the fabric, and interpreting each by the other'.⁴³ All the accounts were dominated by an interest in dating the different elements of the cathedral. Nevertheless, they all – and specifically Paley and Poole, whose accounts were original – reached different conclusions, represented in diagrammatic form in Figure 19.2.

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-002a Here]

Figure 19.2A Plan of Peterborough Cathedral shaded to identify the building chronology according to F. A. Paley (created by A. Buchanan, based on the plan from John Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the Abbey, and Cathedral Church of Peterborough*, London 1828).

Buchanan to provide more detailed caption at proof stage

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-002b Here]

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-002c Here]

Figure 19.2B Plan of Peterborough Cathedral shaded to identify the chronology according to Poole (created by A. Buchanan, based on the plan from Britton as Fig. 2A).

Buchanan to provide more detailed caption at proof stage

– Figs 2A + 2B + 2Paley’s dating key as full double page image in colour

Paley’s approach was primarily archaeological and his observations were acute. He was the first to problematize the construction of the nave, where he noticed that the easternmost bays belonged to the same period of construction as the eastern arm, that further west there were two types of base: those of a typical Romanesque steeply pitched form and the type which Rickman had characterized as ‘water-holding’ and associated with the Early English style, and that in the third bay from the west there was evidence of an earlier west front with twin towers at the end of the aisles. He also distinguished the west transept from the present west front but suggested that the west wall of the west transept was associated with the west front.

As mentioned, Poole’s account was written independently of Paley’s but then had to take account of the latter’s evidence. His starting point was that the chronicle attributions were correct and that therefore Abbot Benedict (1177–94) had to be responsible for the entire nave, including the west transept. Because Abbot Ernulf (1107–14), was recorded as erecting only claustral buildings, Poole concluded that the Anglo-Saxon church had survived the fire of 1069 and no part was replaced until the start of work by Abbot John de Séez (1114–25). The claustral buildings suggested the scale of the Anglo-Saxon building: the nave was the length of the north

walk of the cloister; the transepts had western aisles, to correspond with the western cloister walk, and the length of the choir was determined by the (retained) position of the high altar. He therefore argued that the former western towers, identified by Paley, were Benedict's replacements of Anglo-Saxon originals. The changes in the work noted by Paley were explained as breaks occurring as the Saxon church was gradually taken down and a change in plan by Benedict, who originally wanted to emulate the twin towered front of Canterbury but was later inspired to emulate the western transept of Lincoln.

Paley reasserted his original views in his 1859 edition, only accepting those arguments which did not contradict his original position, but maintained a gentlemanly politeness towards Poole, 'for whose opinion on architectural matters I have the greatest respect'.⁴⁴ Meanwhile Davys, in his second edition of 1859, modified his account to align with Paley's.

On first analysis, all three authors fit the description of 'local antiquaries': although none was born locally, Peterborough was their local cathedral; their research benefited from their familiarity with the site, and their texts were issued by local publishers. Only Poole's account appeared in a journal with a national readership (via the Associated Architectural Societies) and none presented their arguments before a national audience. However, they also offer some challenges to the local/national distinction. Despite Paley's preference for the Camdenian terminology of First Pointed over Early English etc., all were very evidently confident in their use of the most up-to-date archaeological language and methods. Davys here distinguished himself from his readers, whom he did not expect to be fully conversant with current terminology. Moreover all assumed a mantle of expertise by adopting metacritical positions, particularly the right to be able to pronounce on previous scholarship.⁴⁵ Paley paraded his beyond-local knowledge by creating a ranking of England's cathedrals by architectural significance which situated Peterborough in the second division, thus evading any charges of local partisanship;⁴⁶ whilst Poole sought to distinguish himself from local scholarship by contradicting the generally held belief that the nave roof was the work of Abbot Benedict:

And here another much agitated question – the date of the ceiling of the nave – occurs, as connected with the history of the tower. I am afraid that I shall not rise in the estimation of the local antiquarians, when I confess that I think it is, at least in its present form, of the same date with the present tower – that is, of the fourteenth century.⁴⁷

Finally, none exhibited the pretentious writing style held to typify the local antiquarian.

Despite their expertise, however, when it came to the A.I. Congress, all three either performed or were made to play a subordinate role by the organizers (led by the A.I.'s secretary, Albert Way, merely supported by the local committee). Davys was present and opened his father's church at Castor to the visiting archaeologists but did not give a lecture. We do not know whether Poole or Paley attended, but all three were named when the Institute's own expert, Professor Robert Willis, came to pronounce on the cathedral.

James's opening lecture had predicted a battle on the subject of the west front and several previous congresses had seen a show-down between Willis and a local antiquary.⁴⁸ Willis had often implied that it was his method alone that had enabled him to identify constructional chronologies, but Paley had stated that skill was also involved (see quotation above). Willis's audience probably expected him to adjudicate between the accounts and rank the scholars' relative expertise. However, Willis emphasized he had reached his own conclusions prior to reading any secondary literature:

In making his inquiries, however, as to Peterborough Cathedral, he adhered to his invariable custom of ignoring all previous writers until he had made his own investigations. After that, he read what others had written upon the subject. Unless investigations were pursued in that manner, the mind could not be kept free from bias, and the truth would never be arrived at.⁴⁹

Typically, Willis's presentation was in two parts: a formal lecture at which he laid out the methodological issues, historiography and documentary evidence, and a tour, which drew

attention to the physical evidence confirming his account. This was normally the high point of the congress but, frustratingly, in 1861 the *Gentleman's Magazine* remarked only that it would 'hardly admit of a report'.⁵⁰ Although this might imply Willis's paper lacked his usual flair, archival research suggests that his analysis was both original and acute.

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-003 Here]

Figure 19.3 Robert Willis's sketch of the upper side of the vault of the New Work at Peterborough Cathedral (CUL, MS Add 5138, fol. 39).

Source: Syndics of Cambridge University Library

– 1/3rd – 1/2 page

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-004 Here]

Figure 19.4 Robert Willis's sketch of the upper side of the vault of the New Work at Peterborough Cathedral (CUL, MS Add 5138, fol. 63).

Source: Syndics of Cambridge University Library

– 1/3rd – 1/2 page

Willis's claim to have drawn conclusions prior to reading at least the more recent accounts is supported by archival evidence. Study of Peterborough is first demonstrated by his extraordinary view of the upper side of the fan vaults in the New Work, produced for a lecture given in a series of notes on the monastic buildings in 1846 and 1848 and returned on 12 September 1849, when he drew the mouldings of the north and south transept windows.⁵¹ At some point he recorded mouldings using the cymagraph, a piece of equipment he had designed for the purpose.⁵² A separate series of notes, probably also dating from the 1840s, lists all the recorded dates for Peterborough.⁵³ Nevertheless his sketchbook also suggests close attention to the published works, offering a rare note of caution in relation to the chronicles: 'The abbot was neither designer or master builder but was the promoter of the work'.⁵⁴ This would have enabled him to

take what was useful from the chronicles but to avoid the inevitable clash between Paley and Poole. Because not a single report of Willis's lecture describes his position on the chronology of the nave and the west front, it seems likely that he avoided making too vehement a pronouncement, leaving his listeners to infer that his preference was for Paley's chronology. His solution to the problem of their anachronistic style was that Peterborough was an interesting example of extreme uniformity of style across three quarters of a century.

The sketchbook notes: 'Choir & transepts one work. Nave another'.⁵⁵ Like Poole, he probably recognized that the liturgical choir originally lay beneath the crossing and that therefore the 'choir' included part of the nave, accounting for the similarities Paley had identified but without recognizing their liturgical rationale. Willis seems also to have questioned Paley's archaeological interpretations, noting that 'Courses of stones when continuous do not necessarily prove that the work was not intermitted. Ditto when discontinuous does shew that it was intermitted'.⁵⁶ Moreover, although there is no evidence that he disagreed with Paley's identification of the evidence of towers, he disputed that the nook-shafts whose caps were clearly inserted had originally stretched up into a higher story as Paley had argued.⁵⁷ This shows that he must have accessed the gallery level, where the south side demonstrates the impossibility of Paley's suggestion (Figure 19.5). That the note in question mentions 'Mr Paley's towers' proves a *terminus post quem* of 1849 for these notes and shows that Willis was responding to secondary sources; he elsewhere mentions Poole.⁵⁸

[Insert 15031-2722-019-Figure-005 Here]

Figure 19.5 Peterborough Cathedral, gallery, south aisle, westernmost bay looking east.

Source: Jackie Hall

– 1/3rd page

Another source of contention was the nave roof. The chronicles suggested that this was the work of Benedict, with which Davys had concurred but Poole denied. According to Thomas

Craddock, Willis ‘turned his eye to the roof when he got to the west door, and said “I say nothing about the roof. It may be original or it may not; I can give no opinion on the matter”’.⁵⁹

By not engaging with still-current debates, Willis may have been tacitly acknowledging that previous scholarship occupied a middle ground between his work and the subaltern scholarship he usually contradicted: they were gentlemanly scholars from similar social circles to his own, rather than ‘low people, upstarts and plebeians’.⁶⁰ He even claimed Paley as a pupil, albeit with reservations.⁶¹ Instead of critiquing existing accounts, he focussed on creating new knowledge by identifying the remains of the monastic buildings. In Davys’s 1863 edition, a footnote mentions that Willis had found the plinth-course of the ancient chapter-house in the modern building on its site and that over the west aisle of the south transept, the gables and windows of the dormitory passageway could be seen.⁶² This observation probably also derived from Willis, showing that he recognized the dormitory had been to the east of the cloister, rather than on the west as had been argued by Poole.⁶³

Apparently without acknowledgement, Willis concurred with Poole’s hypothesis as to the form of the previous church. As he noted in his sketchbook: ‘At Peterborough the cloister marks the site of the south wall of the nave. Its return shows that the transept if there was one was more westward than the present? For the rest of the nave we have no data but it was probably much less than the present & its eastern arm short’.⁶⁴ That he may have intended an earlier unrecorded Norman church is perhaps suggested by another comment: ‘Saxon church generally in a diff[eren]t site from its Norman successor & much smaller’.⁶⁵ However, his comment on the location of the western transept in relation to a former church seems to correspond with what was found in the 1890s by J.T. Irvine and then claimed as the Saxon church.⁶⁶

As already mentioned, Davys’s 1863 edition took some of Willis’s comments on board, but greater evidence of Willis’s ideas is found in the guide by Thomas Craddock, a local tutor and notable photographer, who showed photographs of Peterborough Cathedral at the 1851 Great Exhibition.⁶⁷ He had previously written a history of Wisbech (1833, revised 1849) which

adopted Rickman's stylistic labels, but made no original points. There is nothing in Craddock's background to suggest that he would independently have been capable of the scholarly originality contained in his guidebook. Paley's account forms the basis of his chronology (he had been unable to locate Poole's article), but he nevertheless did not accept Paley's arguments uncritically, aiming to avoid what he termed 'loose re-production and feminine fluency', familiar criticisms of local scholarship.⁶⁸ It is clear that although the majority of his book was supposedly written in 1859, he had heard Willis's presentation, which would have reinforced his faith in Paley and provided new information on the monastic buildings, the most original element of his account.⁶⁹ The description is unusually detailed for its date and, in addition to those offices previously identified, readers were newly alerted to the prior's residence, the hospitium, stables, and the dwellings of the various officers (all identified on Willis's plan discussed below and presumably described in his 1861 tour). Craddock's guide thus demonstrates the transformation of local knowledge through exposure to national expertise, the very object the A.I. congresses aimed to achieve. Further evidence of such knowledge transfer is found in the sixth (1886) edition of Davys's *Guide*, which included a plan of the monastic complex provided by Willis. The two had met in the later 1840s, apparently through Willis's friend, David James Stewart, whom Davys revered as the precentor of Ely, responsible for reviving its choral tradition.⁷⁰ Davys later wrote: 'I had the great privilege some years ago of accompanying Professor Willis and Canon Stewart in a very careful survey of the remains of this great monastery, and at the end of my book will be found a copy of a plan of this building, which was then laid down, Professor Willis remarking at the time that, next to Canterbury, he had never found such remains more perfect'.⁷¹ The deference of the 'local' man to the 'national' authority with his wider frame of reference is self-evident. The addition of Willis's plan gave Davys's work national rather than local significance and it may be no coincidence that this edition acquired a new London publisher (Simpkin, Marshall and Company), which gave the text wider circulation. That both Craddock and Davys remained key texts for researchers is evidenced

through John Bilson. When discussing the cathedral's chronology with Charles Peers, author of the account in the *Victoria County History*, his main point of reference was Craddock, and he also owned a copy of the sixth edition of Davys.⁷²

Willis's lecture and its reception was not the only opportunity for interaction between local and national forms of architectural knowledge during the Peterborough Congress. Other architectural contributions were made by John Henry Parker and Freeman. Like Britton before them, they had acquired their status within the archaeological community by omnipresence and self-promotion. Neither had any external credentials: as his own publisher, Parker's books were subject to no editorial review (he also published many of the archaeological transactions and proceedings in which his articles appeared), and Freeman was at that date still an independent scholar. They were both well-travelled, but neither has an impressive track record in terms of modern understandings: Freeman believed Waltham Abbey was a pre-Conquest building and Parker argued that Early English Gothic was stylistically ahead of that of France.⁷³ Nevertheless, their authority was stamped on the congress from the start.

Both men gave introductory presentations: Parker on Longthorpe Tower and the domestic architecture of Northamptonshire, to which Freeman responded, at length but apparently unscheduled, on the ecclesiastical architecture of the county.⁷⁴ Their aim was to set local architecture within a national frame of reference, alerting the audience to typical features and their wider significance in a manner which both required and demonstrated more general knowledge. Another way in which local/national distinctions were performed was on the visits, where most sites were opened by their owners or incumbents but were introduced by A.I. authorities. Aside from Davys at Castor, Parker, and Freeman shared responsibility for describing the medieval buildings, again in a similar vein. Their expertise was demonstrated by their ability to put local sites into a national or international comparative framework: at one point Freeman even likened the timber-vaulted nave of Warmington to the cathedral of Amiens, a comparison more demonstrative of his knowledge of French High Gothic than his understanding

of Early English parish church architecture.⁷⁵ He also noted how the wider experience by which he distinguished himself had expanded his understanding: where once he had considered Fotheringhay Church ‘one of the finest things that could be . . . a familiarity with Somersetshire had taught him better’.⁷⁶

As well as placing local monuments within a wider context, Parker and Freeman affirmed their value in terms of current national debates, emphasizing the public significance of their expertise. 1861 was the height of the ‘Battle of the Styles’ over the Government Offices, in which Lord Palmerston had declared the Gothic style incompatible either with a Protestant nation or with practical needs.⁷⁷ This had led to a Parliamentary enquiry, chaired by Alexander Beresford Hope (proprietor of the *Saturday Review*), to which George Gilbert Scott and other architects were called as expert witnesses. We do not know whether Hope was present at the Peterborough Congress but on several occasions during proceedings, Freeman and Parker took the opportunity offered by site visits to ridicule the ignorance of both Palmerston and the general public, who were said to believe all medieval buildings once had ecclesiastical functions (thus making Gothic unsuitable for secular purposes).⁷⁸ Here they were not only asserting their superior knowledge but also claiming it as a public benefit, drawing from a model of expertise more familiar in science.⁷⁹

Throughout the Congress and in its reporting, an archaeological hierarchy which prioritized the voices of national figures was performed and reinforced, as discussed above. Yet as already mentioned, it was most vociferously expressed by Freeman, who stood to benefit from its existence. Cloaked in anonymity in the pages of the *Saturday Review*, Freeman can be identified as the author of all the articles which sought to regulate the relationship and which framed the identification of the Peterborough Congress as an example of appropriate interaction.⁸⁰ Both in the articles and at the Congress, the authority of figures such as himself was emphasized by being placed in the same category as experts with external credentials – figures such as Professors Willis and Babington, Henry Riley, and Edwin Guest (Master of Caius

College, Cambridge), whilst local antiquaries were both praised for knowing their place and castigated for any transgression. The language employed is similar to that used to reinforce class relationships, but Freeman was as dismissive of grantees who stepped outside their field of competence as he was of social peers and more plebeian figures. Although Peterborough boasted a long list of local patrons, he endorsed the restricted number of toasts and speeches; he commended the local clergy for welcoming and entertaining but not dominating discussion, and praised the sites selected for visiting as both truly local and worthy of national attention.⁸¹ By highlighting appropriate practice, we can see Freeman trying to construct authority, in a field where the characteristics of expertise were still under negotiation. As shown here, antiquarian expertise involved use of appropriate language; being able to contribute to knowledge creation and methodological debate (but methods were not universally agreed); adequate local experience (but this could be limited to a few days' visits, as in the case of Willis), and the ability to set this within a wider context: geographically, historically and in the service of modern needs. The case study of Peterborough suggests expertise could be linked to authority, but the latter was more strongly associated with its assertion by the individual and acceptance by the community and was mediated via the periodical press. Although the scholarship on Peterborough reveals that distinctions between local and national scholars were far from being straightforward, with the figures of Davys, Paley, and Poole, as well as Freeman and Parker, all suggesting that there was a spectrum of levels and types of expertise, nevertheless within the context of the A.I. Congress, a simple polarity was accepted and maintained by both the community and the media. 'National' status authorized information and helped it to reach more general acceptance as 'useful knowledge', both locally and nationally.

Notes

- ¹ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], ‘The Archaeological Institute at Peterborough’, *Saturday Review*, 12, no. cccii (1861), 142–43. Attributions based on internal evidence by comparison with articles known to be his: M. M. Bevington, *The Saturday Review 1855–1868: Representative Educated Opinion in Victorian England* (New York 1941), 342–46 and W. R. W. Stephens, *Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (London 1895), vol. I, 146.
- ² A. Ophir and S. Shapin, ‘The Place of Knowledge: A Methodological Survey’, *Science in Context* 4, no. i (1991), 3–22 (16); J. A. Secord, ‘Knowledge in Transit’, *Isis*, 95, no. iv (2004), 654–72 (655).
- ³ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], ‘Local Antiquaries’, *Saturday Review*, 14, no. ccclviii (1862), 273–74 (274).
- ⁴ Society of Antiquaries of London, Way papers, MS 700/VII, Meeting of the Central Committee 26 March 1845. The A.I.’s membership was initially listed by county in the *Archaeol. J.*, with the local secretary identified.
- ⁵ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], ‘Reviews of Recent Antiquarian Works: English Topography’, *The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science*, 2, no. vii (1842), 1–12 (2); H. Longueville Jones, ‘The Antiquities of France’, *Gentleman’s Magazine* (July 1839), 74.
- ⁶ L. Miskell, *Meeting Places: Scientific Congresses and Urban Identity in Victorian Britain* (Farnham and Burlington VT 2013), 35.
- ⁷ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], ‘Archaeological Meetings’, *Saturday Review*, 10, no. ccliii (1860), 266–68.

- ⁸ C. Smith and J. Agar eds., *Making Space for Science: Territorial Themes in the Shaping of Knowledge* (Basingstoke 1998); D. N. Livingstone, *Putting Science in Its Palace: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge* (Chicago 2003); R. Powell, 'Geographies of Science: Histories, Localities, Practices, Futures', *Progress in Human Geography*, 31 (2007), 309–30; D. A. Finnegan, 'The Spatial Turn: Geographical Approaches in the History of Science', *Journal of the History of Biology*, 41, no. ii (2008), 369–88; D. N. Livingstone and C. W. J. Withers ed., *Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Science* (Chicago and London 2011).
- ⁹ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], 'Archaeological Meetings' (as in n. 7); Anon. [E. A. Freeman], 'The Archaeological Institute at Peterborough', *Saturday Review*, 12, no. ccii (1861), 142.
- ¹⁰ *Archaeological Journal*, 18 (1861), 380–85.
- ¹¹ Obituary, *Gentleman's Magazine* (January 1864), 119–20.
- ¹² T. James, Review article, *Quarterly Review*, 101, no. cci (January 1857), 1–56 (1–2).
- ¹³ *Archaeological Journal*, 18 (1861), 381.
- ¹⁴ *Gentleman's Magazine* (September 1861), 263.
- ¹⁵ *Gentleman's Magazine* (September 1861) Ibid. For modern views on the date of the Hedda Stone see Rosemary Cramp in this volume.
- ¹⁶ M. Ogborn and C. W. J. Withers ed., *Geographies of the Book* (Farnham and Burlington, VT 2010).

- ¹⁷ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], 'Local Topographical Works', *Saturday Review*, 16, no. cdxviii (1863), 595–96.
- ¹⁸ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], 'Local Antiquaries', *Saturday Review*, 14, no. ccclviii (1862), 273–74 (274).
- ¹⁹ S. Gunton, *The History of the Church of Peterborough* (London 1686), reprinted with introductory essay by J. Higham (Peterborough and Stamford 1990).
- ²⁰ Probably excavated in 1743: W. D. Sweeting, 'Abbot's Coffin at Peterborough, opened 1743', *Fenland Notes & Queries*, 4 (Jan. 1898-Oct. 1900), 9-10.
- ²¹ J. Britton, *The History and Antiquities of Peterborough Cathedral* (London 1828), 54 (footnote).
- ²² Britton, *History and Antiquities* Ibid., vi.
- ²³ Britton, *History and Antiquities* Ibid., 61–66.
- ²⁴ J. Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury* (London 1815), vii.
- ²⁵ J. Britton, *The History and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of Norwich* (London 1820), ii.
- ²⁶ Anon., 'Peterborough', *The Mirror of Literature, Amusement, and Instruction*, 21, no. dciii (11 May 1833), 290–93 (image of Hedda Stone reproduced from *The Antiquarian and*

Topographical Cabinet, 1 (1817); G. S. Phillips, *A Guide to Peterborough Cathedral* (London 1843).

²⁷ G. S. Phillips, *A Guide to Peterborough Cathedral*, 3rd edn (London 1949), 80.

²⁸ *Northampton Mercury* (30 September 1854).

²⁹ W. Whellan, *Gazetteer and Directory of Northamptonshire* (London 1849), 680, 687–88.

³⁰ *The Bookseller* (1914), 103 suggests Caster was Clarke's nephew.

³¹ *Church of England Magazine*, 4 (January–June 1838), Supplement: Monthly Register of Ecclesiastical Intelligence, 44.

³² *Transactions of the Leicestershire Architectural and Archaeological Society*, 1 (1866), 13.

³³ Anon., 'Architectural and Archaeological Meeting at Peterborough', *Gentleman's Magazine* (September 1855), 298–304.

³⁴ *Second Report of the Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton* (Northampton 1845), 17.

³⁵ *The Ecclesiastic*, 1–2 (1846), 319.

³⁶ H. Collins and R. Evans, *Rethinking Expertise* (Chicago and London 2007), 14–15.

³⁷ O. D. N. B. and N. Pevsner, *Some Architectural Writers of the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford 1972), 137–38.

- ³⁸ F. A. Paley, *Remarks on the Architecture of Peterborough Cathedral* (Peterborough 1849), 4.
- ³⁹ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], ‘Professor Willis’, *Saturday Review*, 39, no. mxi (13 March 1875), 341–42.
- ⁴⁰ G. A. Poole, ‘On the Abbey Church of Peterborough’, *Proceedings of the Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton, in Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers* 3, no. ii (1855), 187–221.
- ⁴¹ Letter from J. Bilson to C. R. Peers (24 May 1905), Oxfordshire Archives, Peers Papers VIII/viii/2h.
- ⁴² O. D. N. B.; Pevsner, *Some Architectural Writers* (as in n. 367); 100; P. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857* (Cambridge 2008), 21 and 42.
- ⁴³ Poole, ‘Peterborough’ (as in n. 3940), 187.
- ⁴⁴ Paley, *Remarks*, 2nd edn (Peterborough 1859), 35.
- ⁴⁵ Collins and Evans, *Rethinking* (as in n. 3536), 14–15 and 60–66.
- ⁴⁶ Paley, *Remarks* (as in n. 3738), 4.
- ⁴⁷ Poole, ‘Peterborough’ (as in n. 3940), 214–15.
- ⁴⁸ A. C. Buchanan, *Robert Willis (1800–1875) and the Foundation of Architectural History* (Woodbridge 2013), chap 5.
- ⁴⁹ Anon., ‘Congress of the Archaeological Institute at Peterborough’, *Gentleman’s Magazine*

(October 1861), 380–91 (383).

50 Anon., ‘Congress of the Archaeological’ Ibid., 384.

51 Cambridge University Library, MS Add. 5043, fols 8v and 40.

52 CUL, MS Add. 5035/111.

53 CUL, MS Add. 5030, fols 153–67.

54 CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. vi.

55 CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. viIbid.

56 CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. viIbid.

57 CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. viIbid.

58 Paley and Davys: CUL, MS Add 5030/149; Poole: CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. 41.

59 T. Craddock, *A General, Architectural, and Monastic History of Peterborough Cathedral* (Peterborough 1864), 210.

60 Said to have been the words used by Willis to describe Britton’s faction at the B.A.A.

Canterbury Congress at which the A.I. breakaway faction was formed: *Morning Herald* (11 September 1845). A similar evaluation could be applied to his most tenacious local opponent, John Browne of York (see Buchanan, *Robert Willis*, cited in footnote 48, 186–97).

- ⁶¹ Anon., 'Congress' (as in n. 4849), 383.
- ⁶² O. W. Davys, *Guide to Peterborough Cathedral*, 3rd edn (Peterborough and London 1863), 44 (footnote).
- ⁶³ Poole, 'Peterborough' (as in n. 3940), 199.
- ⁶⁴ CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. vi.
- ⁶⁵ CUL, MS Add. 5043, fol. viIbid.
- ⁶⁶ J. T. Irvine, 'Discovery of Part of the Saxon Abbey Church of Peterborough', *Journal of the British Archeological Association*, 50 (1894), 45–54.
- ⁶⁷ R. Taylor and L. J. Schaaf, *Impressed by Light: Photographs from Paper Negatives, 1840–1860* (New York 2007), reproduced at www.luminous-lint.com/app/photographer/Thomas_Craddock/A/ (accessed 18 March 2015).
- ⁶⁸ Craddock, *Peterborough* (as in n. 5859), v.
- ⁶⁹ Craddock, *Peterborough* (as in n. 58)Ibid., vi.
- ⁷⁰ O. W. Davys, *A Long Life's Journey, with Some I Met Along the Way* (London 1913), 33.
- ⁷¹ O. W. Davys, 'Peterborough Cathedral, and Its Present Condition', *Journal of the Society of Architects*, 3, no. viii (June 1896), 153–62 (155).
- ⁷² Letters from Bilson to Peers (23 and 24 May 1905), Oxfordshire Archives, Peers Papers, XVIII/viii/2g-2h. Bilson bequeathed his library to the Yorkshire Archaeological Society,

but many have recently been deaccessioned and sold. Bilson's inscribed copy of Davys is now in my possession.

- ⁷³ C. Dade-Robertson, 'Architecture as Evidence: E. A. Freeman and Harold's Church', in *Making History: Edward Augustus Freeman and Victorian Cultural Politics*, ed. G. A. Bremner and J. Conlin, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 202 (Oxford 2015), 157–75 and S. Bradley, 'The Englishness of Gothic: Theories and Interpretations from William Gilpin to J. H. Parker', *Architectural History*, 45 (2002), 325–46.
- ⁷⁴ *Gentleman's Magazine* (September 1861), 268–70.
- ⁷⁵ Anon., 'Congress' (as in n. 4849), 388.
- ⁷⁶ Anon., 'Congress' (as in n. 48), 388Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ D. B. Brownlee, 'That "Regular Mongrel Affair": G. G. Scott's Design for the Government Offices', *Architectural History*, 28 (1985), 159–97; I. Topliss, *The Foreign Office: An Architectural History* (London 1987); G. A. Bremner, 'Nation and Empire in the Government Architecture of mid-Victorian London: The Foreign and India Office Reconsidered', *Historical Journal*, 48, no. iii (2005), 703–42; B. Porter, *The Battle of the Styles: Society, Culture and the Design of a New Foreign Office, 1855–61* (London and New York 2011).
- ⁷⁸ Anon. [E. A. Freeman], 'Archaeological Institute' (as in n. 1).
- ⁷⁹ E. H. Ash ed., *Expertise: Practical Knowledge and the Early Modern State* (Chicago 2010); W. J. Ashworth, 'Quality and the Roots of Manufacturing "expertise" in Eighteenth-century Britain', *Osiris*, 25, no. i (2010), 231–54; D. Leggett and J. Davey, 'Introduction:

Expertise and Authority in the Royal Navy, 1800–1945’, *Journal for Maritime Research*,
16, no. i (2014), 1–13.

80 For attribution evidence, see n. 1.

81 Anon. [E. A. Freeman], ‘Archaeological Institute’ (as in n. 1).